

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application based on the foregoing amendments and following remarks. By this Amendment, claims 1-2, 4-6, 9, 11-13, 16-17, 19-21, 24 and 26-28 have been amended, claims 34-42 have been canceled, and new claims 43-49 have been added. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 9, 11-13, 16-17, 19-21, 24, 26-28, and 31-33 and 43-49 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103 in view of Havinis and Rosenthal

Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 9, 11, 13, 16-17, 19, 21, 24, 26 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,134,447 to Havinis et al. ("Havinis") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,737,701 to Rosenthal et al. ("Rosenthal"). For reasons set forth more fully below, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 (with similar amendments in each of the other independent claims 9, 16, and 24). Among other things, the claims now even more clearly require:

1. Maintaining separate and distinct lists of resource identifiers, wherein each of the resource identifiers is usable within a network to establish network communications between a requesting party and a resource
2. A "system-wide" list comprising a plurality of different resource identifiers
3. A "plurality" of lists of resource identifiers respectively associated with subscribers.
4. First determining whether to permit or deny requested network communications by comparing a requested resource identifier with the plurality of identifiers in the system-wide list, and without regard to a subscriber identity associated with the requesting party.
5. If the requested resource identifier is not in the system-wide list, next retrieving the subscriber identity of the requesting party, using it to retrieve one of the plurality of lists, and determining whether the requested resource identifier is included in the retrieved list.

Havinis describes a system and method for providing or barring access to location services that can determine the location of a cell phone (see the Title). In Havinis's system, subscribers (e.g. law enforcement agencies, fleet management companies, etc.) send requests to a Gateway Mobile Location Center (GMLC) to determine a cell phone's position or location. The GMLC first determines a subscriber identity associated with the request with identities stored on a black list 392 or gray list 394. The black list is used to bar location services for subscribers who have not paid their bills, and the gray list is used to monitor requests for location services.

Clearly, Havinis's lists of subscribers are not "lists of resource identifiers" which are usable within a network to establish network communications between a requesting party and a resource.

Moreover, Havinis does not teach or suggest determining whether to permit or deny requested network communications by comparing a requested resource identifier with one or more lists of resource identifiers in a list or plurality of lists. Rather, the black list and gray list are used to identify subscribers whose requests for location services may be barred or monitored.

Still further, Havinis's black and gray lists are not consulted without regard to a subscriber identity associated with the requesting party. Clearly, even if a "Where am I" service is used by a cell phone subscriber, the cell phone subscriber must provide a LAIN, which is a subscriber identity associated with the requesting party (i.e. cell phone user).

Rosenthal merely allows users to store their own speed dial lists of telephone numbers. It does not teach or suggest a "system-wide" list that is used to control requests for network communications without regard to a subscriber identity associated with the requesting party. Nor does it teach or suggest a progression from consulting a "system-wide" list then to subscriber-specific lists as required by the amended independent claims.

Accordingly, even if the references are combined as alleged in the Office Action, the present invention is not suggested. Accordingly, Applicants submit independent claims 1, 9, 16, and 24, together with claims 2, 4-6, 11-13, 16-17, 19-21, 24, 26-28, and 31-41 that depend therefrom, patentably define over Havinis and Rosenthal.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103 in view of Havinis, Rosenthal and other References

Claims 5, 12, 20, 27, 33, 36, 39, and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Havinis and Rosenthal in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,330,311 Mijares et al. ("Mijares"). Claims 31, 34, 37, and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Havinis and Rosenthal in view of Rowell et al, WO 9704602 ("Rowell"). Claims 32, 35, 38, and 41 stand rejected as being allegedly unpatentable over Havinis and Rosenthal in view of Rudokas, US Patent 5,420,910 ("Rudokas"). For reasons set forth more fully below, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 34-42 have been canceled herewith, rendering the rejection thereof moot.


The remaining claims depend ultimately from independent claims 1, 9, 16, and 24 and thus are patentable for at least the reasons presented above. The deficiencies noted above are not cured by the alleged combinations with Mijares, Rowell, or Rudokas. For example, neither Mijares, Rowell, nor Rudokas teach or suggest the concurrent maintenance of both a system-wide list of resource identifiers and a user specific list of resource identifiers, or the progression of first comparing the requested resource identifier to the system-wide list, and next comparing the requested resource identifier to a subscriber specific list if the requested resource is not in the system-wide list as required by amended independent claims 1, 9, 16, and 39.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If any issues remain which the Examiner feels may be resolved through a telephone interview, s/he is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP

Date: February 21, 2008


Mark J. Danielson
(650) 233-4777

40,580
Reg. No.

Please reply to customer no. 27,498